THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX MAY, 1946 No. 311

Editorial

WE commend to the serious consideration of our readers in England the letter from Canon Peacey, which will be found on p. 144. It must be confessed that for several years a section of the Church of England appears to have been more keen about obstructing the South India Scheme of Union than about anything else. We say "appears" advisedly, since we are loath to believe that the agitation which has been carried on reflects the deepest interests of those who have lent themselves to it. For members of the Church of England to take upon themselves to lecture the Church in India about church order will strike anyone who faces the facts which Canon Peacey specifies as the limit of presumption. Even if he has got the facts about the present condition of the Church of England a little out of focus, the main ground of the indictment stands. It may not be dismissed because he exaggerates the degree of our lawlessness, disregards the circumstances which have caused and to some extent palliate it, or assigns a questionable virtue to liturgical uniformity.

The main point is that there is a section of the Church of England, perhaps more vociferous than influential, which argues and agitates in lofty terms about the importance of episcopacy in the abstract or in India, while it not only acquiesces in but promotes a practical parody of episcopal church government in England itself. What title has a church, so lacking in order and discipline at every level, to obstruct a sister church which puts it to shame in these respects and in others as well? If we are to have an ecclesiastical agitation, let it be one for transforming our decadent prelacy into a renewed episcopacy at home. Then we may have some witness to bear to our brethren abroad through our example as well as through our words. Then we may both discover and prove that there is a vast difference between the unity of a party and the unity of a church.

We do not wish to suggest that only one section of the Church of England is to be blamed. The guilt for having allowed the present state of affairs to develop without any serious attempt to make a fresh start lies heavily on the whole Church. Let him that is without sin cast the first stone. We all know how to put the blame on the Bishops or on the Anglo-Catholics or on the Protestants or on the Liberals or on the Neo-orthodox or on those who are all things to all men, as the case may be—on anyone but ourselves. This is bad enough. But when it comes to churchmen in England having the impertinence to suggest that the unity and catholicity of the Anglican communion are being menaced by the proceedings of their brethren in India—if that is not the limit, we should like to know what is! Was there ever a more exact illustration of the parable of the mote and the beam?

Whatever we may say on our platforms or write in our tracts for the times, we cannot but be heartily ashamed of ourselves if we contemplate the Lord's will for His Church, and beside it the state of the Church of England and its failure so far, in spite of endless talk, to reform its own order. But we are not despondent, for beneath the surface there are many signs of dawning repentance and of a desire for a new approach to unity both among ourselves and with all our separated brethren. At the level of the local church and in the parishes and in the rural deaneries, if not in the dioceses, it is possible at once to begin to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.

* * * * *

We publish this month the first of a new series of articles which will appear from time to time under the general title "Why you should read it." The object of the series is to direct attention to some more or less forgotten, but not rare, works of English divinity. The contributors are being asked to supply some information about the author of the book under consideration and the circumstances of its publication, as well as about the contents of the book itself, and then to indicate what profit may be derived from reading it today.

* * * * *

We extend a cordial, though rather belated, welcome to a contemporary, called *Divinity*. It is a quarterly review, edited by some members of the Church of Ireland.[1] The four numbers that have so far been published are of general theological interest, while naturally articles are included which deal with the peculiar problems of the Church of Ireland. *Divinity* is worth watching.

Natural Law in the Bible—I

The Bible, in both Testaments, is concerned with a supernatural revelation communicated in history. The history consists of a series of providentially directed events, with the interpretation of these events by men of inspired insight; event and interpretation interlocking inseparably. The entire sequence of events took place within the history of a single community, which passed through many phases—Hebrew clans, Israelite kingdom, Jewish Dispersion, Catholic Church—but remained continuous and self-identical all through.

The revelation takes the form of an active relation between God and man, with man as an actor, however subordinate an actor, in the drama, and not a passive spectator.[2] This active relation is characteristically described in terms of a "covenant" between God and man; a covenant being a transaction which sets up enduring relations between the parties, creates a certain status, and entails particular obligations. The New Testament speaks of *two* covenants, the old and

[1] 4s. 6d. per annum, post free. Communications should be addressed to Major Richard Garratt, R.A., 20 Donegall Square East, Belfast.

[2] This conforms to the Hebrew as derived from the Greek conception of "knowing God," according to Bultmann's definition in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch*.

the new; but it ascribes to the two a peculiarly profound connexion. The old covenant is not simply superseded by the new, nor is it simply amended; it is "fulfilled." Fulfilment includes denial upon one level and total reaffirmation upon a new level—ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. xi, 29).

A covenant between God and man cannot in the nature of things be a negotiated treaty between plenipotentaries. It is offered by God to man for his willing acceptance. The initiative lies wholly with God; it is for man to respond; but that response makes him an active participator in the transaction; it makes him responsible before God for the obligations which the covenant entails. Thus the documents, or scriptures, or, shall we say, the charter, of the covenant has two essential elements: a declaration of the act of God by which the covenant was initiated, and a recital of His demands; in Jewish terms, Haggada and Halacha; in New Testament terms, *kerygma* and *didaché*, or Gospel and Commandment. "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt: thou shalt have none other gods before me; thou shalt not make any graven image; honour father and mother; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal. . . ." That is the twofold pattern of the old covenant. Similarly, in the New Testament the *kerygma* sets forth what God has done through the coming of Christ, His life, work, death and resurrection, and upon this follows a statement of obligation—*e.g.*: "I beseech you *therefore* by the mercies of God, present your bodies a living sacrifice . . . abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good . . . be kindly affectioned one to another. . . ." (Rom. xii, 1*ff.*). Such is the form of the new covenant with its obligations.

In various parts of the New Testament the contrast is drawn sharply between the old law and the new. But at the same time it is made clear that it is the one Law of God with which we are concerned. "Are we making the Law of none effect?" asks Paul, after one of his most damaging attacks upon the "law of commandments contained in ordinances," and answers: "God forbid! We are establishing the Law" (Rom. iii, 31). Similarly, in the Gospel according to Matthew Jesus, in spite of His drastic treatment of what "was said to them of old time," declares Himself come not to destroy the Law but to fulfil it (Matt. v, 17). He reaffirms the most sacred and authoritative summary of the obligations of the Law among the Jews—the *Shema*: "Hear, O Israel! The Lord thy God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;" and in the same way Paul, having discoursed upon the ethic of *agapé*, which is consequent upon our redemption in Christ, declares such *agapé* to be the πλήρωμα—the total content—of the Law (Rom. xiii, 10).

For our present purpose, then, we shall think of the law of God, in both testaments, as a function of the covenant between God and man established at Mount Sinai in Arabia in the year (*exempli gratia*) 1250 B.C., and renewed about A.D. 30 at Jerusalem. It is, of course, absurd to pretend that such precise dating is actually possible. But events which *might* be dated with precision are, so to speak, the points of concentration for a long-continued and complex process by which

God's law was communicated to men; and to think of them in this way serves to emphasize the *particularity* which attaches to all history. Events happen *here* and not there, *now* and not then, to *this* person or group and not to that; and the historical revelation similarly was given to this particular people in the course of its own history, and not to mankind in general, though it is intended for all mankind in the end.

The biblical conception of the Law of God, then, is primarily that of a "special revelation," by virtue of which the knowledge of God and of His will is given to a particular community, while the rest of mankind remains in ignorance.

At this point the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* demands to be heard—the school which brings the Bible into the field of the Comparative Study of Religion. Its exponents point out that, whatever we may say about the exclusive and unique character of the biblical revelation of the Law of God, in point of fact there is a close likeness, or affinity, between many of its provisions and the ethical principles recognized and promulgated in various ethnic systems. Thus they adduce many striking parallels between the laws of Moses and those of Hammurabi, which were current in regions where the Mosaic code may have taken form, from a period long anterior to Moses. In the New Testament, the *forms* in which ethical teaching is conveyed are often demonstrably based upon models provided by Stoicism, and their *contents* often show so close a similarity to Stoic teaching that it seems artificial to claim that they have no relation one to another. When, for example, Paul confesses that he has learnt to be αὐτάρκης, in poverty and wealth, in prosperity and adversity (Phil. iv, 11), he is not only using Stoic language; he is expressing conformity to a moral ideal which was original in the Stoic school. Nor does such a passage stand out alone, like a patch on a garment. Stoic morals are woven into the fabric of New Testament ethics. It is true that the robe which Christianity fashions out of the materials is widely different from the Stoic philosopher's cloak. Paul's αὐτάρκεια is by no means the same as Seneca's, because it belongs to a life which is redeemed in Christ. Nevertheless, it is a fact that elements in the revealed Law are present outside the limits of the historical revelation. In some sense and in some degree there appears to be knowledge of God which is not directly derived from His covenant with Israel.

So much, objective observation and reasonable interpretation can establish. We have now to ask how far the Bible itself recognizes and accounts for the presence of such knowledge in men without the Law.

In the main part of the Old Testament mankind beyond the pale of the chosen people is dismissed under the category, "the nations who know not God." Similarly, in the New Testament, Paul roundly declares that "the world by wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. i, 21). In the speech which he is said to have delivered before the Areopagus at Athens, mankind is described as having been in a state of ignorance (ἄγνοια); now at last the knowledge of God is made available (Acts xvii, 30). The way to it is not by the improvement of any knowledge which men may have possessed hitherto, but by "repent-

ance." This is all the more striking because this speech is pre-eminently one of the places where the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* most confidently recognizes the influence of ethnic philosophy. In fact, the greater part of it is pure Stoicism. Yet its theme is, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you" (Acts xvii, 23).

This negative attitude, however, to the Gentile world is not maintained with entire consistency. First, we may recall a passage in 1 Peter —a work, it may be premised, whose outlook is notably eschatological, supernaturalist, or other-worldly. Its readers are addressed as a "peculiar people," who by sheer grace of God have been regenerated into a living hope and an unfading inheritance, and called out of darkness into His marvellous light (1 Pet. i, 3-4, ii, 9-10). As such, they are exhorted to a holiness of life congruous with their calling (*ib.* i, 15-16). After thus reciting the supernatural attributes and obligations of the people of God, the writer proceeds: "Keep your behaviour honourable in the eyes of the Gentiles, in order that where they speak evil of you as wrongdoers, they may observe your good deeds and glorify God" (*ib.* ii, 12); and again: "Keep a good conscience, in order that, where you are slandered, those who misrepresent your good behaviour in Christ may be put to shame" (*ib.* iii, 16). The implication is that there is in pagans a capacity for sound moral judgment, a *communis sensus* which will lead them to recognize as good that which the revealed Law of God declares to be good.

Upon this point Peter and Paul are agreed. In Rom. xii, 17 the members of the Body of Christ, whose mind (νοῦς) has been transformed through the mercies of God, are enjoined to "plan conduct honourable in the sight of all men." (The words are cited from the LXX of Prov. iii, 4, but the regulative word "all" is Paul's own.) Still more striking is a phrase which he lets fall in the discussion of the position and behaviour of women in the church in 1 Cor. xi, 1-16. After giving several reasons, partly drawn from Scripture, why a woman should not go bareheaded, he adds: "Does not Nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, he is dishonoured, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory?" Ἡ φύσις αὐτὴ διδάσκει: the *communis sensus*, then, by which pagans recognize the goodness of conduct ordered by the revealed Law of God is the teaching of Nature.

The acknowledgment of this "Law of Nature"—for by this time we are entitled to use the expression—accounts for the valuation of the State and its ministers in Rom. xiii, 1-6. The agent of secular government is "a servant of God for good ends," θεοῦ διάκονος εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Magistrates are even sacred ministers of God, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες—devoting themselves, in fact, to the work of praising the good and punishing the evil. This "ministry" and "service" to God is dependent upon the power to distinguish rightly between good and evil. It is nevertheless not directed by the revealed Law. It is therefore evident that in judging according to the Law of Nature "men without the Law" serve God.

C. H. Dodd.

(*To be concluded.*)

On Approaching Kierkegaard

THERE are certain formidable difficulties which stand in the way of any reader fresh to Sören Kierkegaard (S.K.) that the reader may be pardoned if he feels overwhelmed and perhaps put off by them. Let the difficulties, however, be known and faced, and they are mitigated; for the tremendous value of S.K.'s teaching cannot become ours if we faint or grow weary before these things.

The first stumbling-block will probably arise through the abnormal mentality of S.K., consequent to some extent on his abnormal upbringing. We *must* know something of S.K.'s life, and we tend quite rightly to read the life first. This always leaves us asking, Is the man mad, and if so what can his value be? I would beg the reader not to be put off. In spite of S.K.'s own references to his "thorn in the flesh," his dark hints that he could not "realize the universal" like others, his introspection and lonely melancholy brooding, his breaking off an engagement of marriage, his extraordinary behaviour thereupon, his fanatical devotion to his father—in spite of all this he is not "mad." He is a dialectician who, from early boyhood, loved to climb the *scala paradisi* of the logical sequence of thought, and who was distressed if any link in the chain of reasoning were missing. His acute dialectic often leads him so to tilt the boat of his argument as to make it list, sometimes alarmingly. But he is always in control (and therefore not mad), even when we long to pull the boat straight again. The boat of contemporary philosophy and religion was already, he thought, listing badly in the wrong direction. If, in pulling it away, he makes it list on the other side, that is because he purposely sets out to be a *correctiv*. We must perceive his purpose and make allowances; he usually knows when he is " correcting."

A second difficulty concerns his plan of authorship; a plan so progressive and consistent that it is not possible to pick up any book of S.K.'s and expect to understand it without seeing it in some sort of relationship to his whole authorship. In *The Point of View* (I suppose one of the world's finest pieces of apologia, and different from others too) S.K. has explained his plan and purpose. While this should certainly be read, it already presupposes knowledge of S.K.'s writings. For this reason, and also because what S.K.'s writings set out to do is itself unique, the book is not terribly helpful to an entirely new reader. He explains that from start to finish he is a religious author; yet we are staggered that much of his writing seems far from religious. He divides his writings into two classes (i) æsthetical, (ii) religious, and the religious purpose behind both comes to this: Life, as he sees it, can be viewed from three angles, or *Stadier* as he calls them in Danish, *i.e.*, levels (Latin *stadia*) or platforms of existence. They are the æsthetic, the ethical and the religious. In his æsthetic works (as he himself designates them) he seeks to depict the first two of the *stadia;* in his religious works, the third. This third, the religious, he regards as the highest, and it is to this that S.K. desires progressively to lead us. But he will be scrupulously fair to all the *stadia*, and will present each life-view at its very best, *leaving us to make our own choice between them.* It is

legitimate to view life's levels thus, even though we recognize that they may in actual life be mixed; for example, the religious must include the ethical and should include also the æsthetic. It is most important to realize that S.K. will not choose for us, but only challenge us to *choose*. Therefore the title of S.K.'s first æsthetic work *Either/Or*, in which the choice between the æsthetic and the ethical types of life is put before us, stands like a motto over the whole authorship, throwing out the kind of challenge which is inherent in all that S.K. writes. I wish space allowed us adequately to examine this work,[1] because it illustrates the process so adequately. In Vol. I a pseudonym, A, sets forth the æsthetical life from various points of view very brilliantly, and the volume ends in a unique composition called the "Diary of a Seducer." Let the reader be patient and go slowly (as S.K. often exhorts us to do). Kierkegaard's purpose is to depict a life lived (as many live it) on the level of pure sense-perception (αἴσθησις), *i.e.* on the level of pleasure and momentary satisfaction only, uncommitted by any decisive and purposeful "ought." In Vol. II, another pseudonym, B, criticizes this view. He is a moralist who seeks to show that by committing oneself to a pursuit of duty, along the ordinary paths of regular work, friendship (involving altruism), and marriage, a man really derives greater satisfaction than from the disintegrated life of the æsthete. Even on the æsthetic level the satisfaction is greater, because in the ethical life there is an equilibrium between the æsthetic and the ethical which enhances both. The work ends with a challenge, called "Ultimatum," thrown into the form of a sermon.

Two forms of life are thus presented to us for choice, and the writing is all of great value in itself. But the third type, the religious, was also, from the start, and in a different way, presented by S.K. Alongside his æsthetical (and pseudonymous) works, S.K. published, in his own name, eighteen definitely religious works in the form of sermons, though he calls them "Edifying Discourses," not sermons, because in his view a sermon required the authority of a priest behind it, which authority he lacked. They are definitely religious, but religious only of a particular kind.[2]

Later on S.K. is going to distinguish between what he calls (i) religion A and (ii) religion B, the latter being full orthodox Christianity and the former a sort of vaguer "religion-in-general," which is the necessary precursor to, and prerequisite of, the other. True to his purpose of *progressive* presentation, S.K. will give us, in these eighteen Discourses, not yet religion B, but the highest and best presentation of religion A that he can; an immanent and almost unitarian form of religion, and that at a very high level. It is most necessary that the orthodox Christian reader shall be apprised of what S.K. is (purposely) here doing, lest he be disappointed. Religion A is the necessary foundation for religion B, and this foundation S.K. will see well and truly laid. But orthodox and unorthodox, Christian and non-Christian, are bound, if they are patient and impartial, to be thrilled

[1] Princeton and Oxford, 2 vols., three translators. *Stages on Life's Way* (Oxford, translated by Lowrie) would equally serve the purpose.

[2] They are in course of publication by the Augsburg Press, translated by Swenson.

with the dialectic and the force of these Discourses. S.K. was disappointed that the public, which so eagerly took *Either/Or*, all but ignored the two religious Discourses he published alongside it. "Suppose [he says] that a reader completely understands and judges the whole æsthetic production, yet he totally misunderstands me if he does not understand the religious totality in my whole work as an author."[1]

But, it will be asked, why this pseudonymous authorship of the æsthetic works? This constitutes yet a third difficulty. It must be admitted that S.K. loved mystification, and sometimes over-indulged this propensity. Yet there lay inherent in S.K.'s purpose the Socratic method of indirect communication. Socrates, whom S.K. ardently admired, would never permit himself to be regarded as a teacher who could impart or implant or beget any knowledge in others which was not there in embryo already. He could only, like a spiritual midwife, bring to birth the knowledge which, Socrates argues, God alone could beget in us. For truth is more than knowledge, it is a way of life. Can a mode of life be taught, or can we only be, as it were, stimulated to bring it out? μαιεύεσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γεννᾶν δὲ ἀπεκώλευσεν, says Socrates in Plato's *Theætetus*. Readers of Plato, especially perhaps of the *Meno*, will know that the Socratic doctrine of Reminiscence (ἀνάμνησις) is closely connected with this. S.K. does not teach this doctrine but another and different one (of tremendous importance) which he calls *Gentagelse*, inadequately translated Repetition. Yet he did teach, in line with Socrates, that, in respect of truth, we are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," as the Fourth Gospel puts it; and that all he (S.K.) or any other human can do is, midwife-like, to assist in bringing to birth what God has begotten in us. He will not hurl a body of doctrine or system of philosophy at us, but try to induce in us a way of life.

So, like a poet (and poet he truly is, both by the ofttimes beauty of his language and power of dramatic presentation), he will get inside characters, living the kind of life he is describing, and speak through their lips; and these characters become his pseudonyms. Let the reader therefore patiently listen to the pseudonyms, not as necessarily giving us S.K.'s final views, but views we should know about at their best. It is true that S.K., at and from the point (*anno* 1848) where his writing passes to the fully Christian, abandoned indirect communication. It had done its work, and that effectively. But "the communication of Christianity must end in witnessing, the maieutic cannot be the last form of communication," he says.[2] And a fearless witness he became.

A fourth difficulty is S.K.'s style. Hegel was the idol of S.K.'s day. The teaching in Copenhagen University and in the Danish Church was impregnated with Hegelianism. From Prof. Martensen, later to be Primate of Denmark, S.K. as a student imbibed, and at first loved Hegelianism. But after a time, and especially after reading Hamann, he became convinced that the "systematic" philosophy, current since Descartes, and culminating with Hegel, had too much abstracted thought from life. Systematic philosophers, he thought, had put Reality

[1] Samlede Vaerker III, p. 552. [2] Papirer IX, A. 221.

into a System, reared it into a beautiful palace, and then could not even live in the palace they had reared, but only in a mud hut beside it.

For when all the schematization has taken place, there still remains the "I"—the *individual* whom S.K. so emphatically speaks of—and "I" find that, for me, reality is not the smoothed-out territory, with "every valley exalted and every mountain made low," which the system made it. There are chasms and precipices I have to leap, choices I have to make, wherein systematic philosophy does not help me. So S.K. parted company with Hegel and became the father of all that "existential" philosophy which is so much the philosophic vogue today. But, though opposing Hegel, S.K. does use Hegel's terminology and modes of thought, meeting him, so to say, on his own ground. The reader must be prepared for this, though, if he be patient, he will not, I think, find the difficulty so formidable as at first it seemed. It is not necessary to be at all deeply conversant with Hegel's own works, though obviously if we are, it is all the better.

A fifth difficulty, the last I must mention, is due to the fact that S.K.'s broken engagement was the very occasion which set free in him all his genius of authorship. It leads him, in the first place, to speak a great deal about the erotic, with a great deal of introspection and cryptic reference to his own case. Often, indeed, he was indirectly justifying himself to his former fiancée. That he at times overdoes this, S.K. well knows; for he makes the pseudonym *Frater Taciturnus*, *e.g.*, say that few would get to the end of Quidan's Diary in the *Stages*. But do we, for example, discard Spenser's *Fairie Queen* because few get to the end of even the seven extant books? S.K.'s introversion is not a lopsided fantasy. Out of his deep experiences he forged a psychology which Reinhold Niebuhr and many other distinguished thinkers speak of as unique. Especially the *Concept of Dread* and *Sickness unto Death* are of marvellous psychological power, difficult though they are. There is hardly, I suppose, anything like them in the world. S.K. has value, in fact, for philosopher and psychologist, Christian and non-Christian alike. His outstanding doctrines—the "Individual" perhaps especially, and many another—are of profound significance for our age; and the reader may be encouraged to surmount initial difficulties and persevere in trying to understand a unique thinker, destined to wield more and more influence.

T. H. Croxall.

Why You Should Read It—I

WILLIAM WALL'S "HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM"

Attention has been turned increasingly in recent years to the doctrine of Baptism, but the subject is still seriously neglected. Many clergymen are perplexed by the problems raised by the practice of infant baptism, and they would do well at this juncture to study the classical English treatise on the subject—William Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*, which was first published in 1705.

Wall was admitted to the vicarage of Shoreham in Kent in 1674.

The presence of a large number of Baptists in the neighbourhood of his parish induced him to turn his thought to a consideration of the question of pædobaptism. He read widely in the literature against the practice, and seems finally to have been driven to its active defence as a result of examining what he regarded as the unwarranted assertions of Danvers' *Treatise of Baptism . . . making it appear that Infants-Baptism was not Practised for near Three Hundred Years*, which had appeared in 1674. Wall's method was to search diligently in the ancient authors of the Church and produce *catenæ* of quotations long enough to avoid the impression of being passages divorced from their contexts and misinterpreted: for the most part he allows the Fathers to speak for themselves and show the veneration in which they held the sacrament of Christian initiation. The book rapidly attracted widespread notice, and the clergy of the Lower House of Convocation voted: "That the thanks of this House be given to Mr Wall for the learned and excellent book he hath lately written concerning infant-baptism." Bishop Atterbury said: "It is a book for which the author deserves the thanks, not of the English clergy alone, but of all Christian churches." A second edition appeared in 1707, and was immediately assailed by John Gale, a learned General Baptist minister; but even his Baptist adversaries spoke of "the very honest, learned, and pious Dr Wall." Gale published, in 1711, *Reflections on Mr Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, and this called forth, in 1720, *A Defence of the History of Infant Baptism, against the Reflections of Mr Gale and Others*, for which Wall received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Oxford by diploma. The *History* and the *Defence* went through many editions: probably the best is that of 1844 by the Oxford University Press, which is edited by Dr Henry Cotton and contains the *History*, Gale's *Reflections*, and the *Defence* in four volumes. But the *History* is within the range of the impecunious frequenter of secondhand-book shops, since it is reprinted in the Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature in two volumes (1889).

With the approach of the centenary of the Gorham controversy—the beginning of the clash with Bishop Henry Phillpotts of Exeter was in the summer of 1846—it is to be hoped that more and deeper study will be given to the doctrine of Baptism. The Gorham case reveals the inadequacies of both the evangelical and high church doctrines. Both are very much occupied with individualizing notions of the sacrament, and it may be that a richer doctrine of Baptism is to be found in what F. D. Maurice had to say as against both these parties. Maurice says of the Puseyites: "By representing Baptism as that which confers a portion of grace on each particular child, and not as that which brings him out of his selfish and individual condition, into the holy and perfect body, they do very much, as I think, to destroy the idea of the church. . . ."[1] For this reason, and because it is "a witness that man is not his own saviour by his faith or by his works,"[2] Maurice says: "We cling to the doctrine of our Baptismal Service for

[1] *The Kingdom of Christ* (1838), Vol. I, p. 96.
[2] *The Church a Family* (1850), p. 32.

Infants, and determine that no power on earth shall take it from us."[1] It is just on these aspects of the doctrine of Baptism that Wall's study of the Fathers, and his presentation of his findings, help us. Wall's excerpts show how much the early authors looked upon Baptism as adoption into a lifelong family relationship with God rather than as conferring at a particular time grace which may subsequently be lost.

Wall is principally concerned to prove that infant baptism has been the practice of the Church from the earliest days. He recognizes that there is no express mention of an infant among those that are recorded in the New Testament as having been baptized by the apostles; but he points out at the same time that there is no account of the baptism of a Christian's child being put off until he was grown up. "The proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not so plain as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for the other side," Wall remarks in his preface; but he goes on to argue from "the practice of the ancient Christians that lived nigh the time of the apostles," pointing out that that is "more largely delivered." There is no evidence that any change of practice was being introduced when the sub-apostolic Church baptized infants, and this, he thinks, is an important factor in the debate: "For such a thing as the general baptizing of infants, being a rite public and notorious . . . cannot be forgotten in a short time, nor altered without a great deal of noise. . . . We Englishmen cannot be ignorant whether infants were usually baptized in England or not, in queen Elizabeth's days, which is the same distance." This argument gives force to his quotation from Origen: "For this also it was, that the church had from the apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants."[2]

Wall probably makes more than is warranted of the internal evidence of Clement of Rome, though he is justified in making use of the argument that there is nothing to indicate a breach with the tradition of baptizing the infants of Jewish proselytes. Justin Martyr speaks of "several persons among us of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, who were made disciples of Christ in their childhood."[3] His treatment of this, and of Tertullian's warning that great caution should be taken about the baptizing of infants, is quite satisfying. It is surprising, however, that he allows himself to pass over St Cyril of Jerusalem, and still more surprising that Gale does not challenge him on this point in the *Reflections*.

But of equal importance to his evidence of the continuity of the practice of infant baptism is Wall's presentation of his witnesses, and the attitude towards the sacrament which is to be observed in the writers whom he cites. He very seldom lets the individual come into his purview at all, and he is insistent upon the Lord's command to make disciples of *all the nations*. " Now this gives great light for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour, when He bids His apostles, 'Go and disciple all the nations and baptize them.' For when a commission is given in such short words, and there is no express direction what they shall do with the infants of those who become

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 33. [2] *Comm. in Rom.*, v. 9. [3] *Apol.* i.

proselytes; the natural and obvious interpretation is, that they must do in that matter as they and the church in which they lived always used to do."[1] His speaking of the practice of the Christian Church in the time of our Lord's earthly life as what the Church "always used to do," together with his general argument from Jewish pædobaptism, show that he had at the back of his mind the continuity of the new Israel with the old; and his reiteration of the command to "disciple the nations" throughout the work is enough to show how alien to his theology was the idea that it is the Church's function, through Baptism, to save individual souls from the perishing mass. A passage which would have delighted Maurice with his antipathy to Pusey's description of Baptism as a "change of nature" and his insistence that children were not born into the world fit only for damnation, but rather that they might claim the inheritance originally prepared for humanity, is the quotation which Wall makes from Clement of Rome: "He that made and formed us, brought us into his own world, having prepared for us his benefits before we were born."[2]

Wall brings out the connexion between Baptism and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in one of his extracts from Irenæus: "They are altogether vain, who undervalue the whole economy of God, and deny any salvation of the flesh and do slight the regeneration of it, saying that it is not capable of a state of incorruption."[3] On this Wall comments: "By their slighting the regeneration of the flesh, he must mean either their denying its resurrection, as many of them did, or else their refusing to give it baptism; which several sects of the Valentinians did . . . not believing any resurrection of the body, but that the soul is all that survives, did not think the body worthy of a baptism." He then goes on to treat of Irenæus' passage on Christ's baptism of the patriarchs in Hades and many other like gems from the early fathers. A passage from Chrysostom brings out well the patristic doctrine of Baptism which is constantly recurring in the first half of Wall's great work: "And yet some think that the heavenly grace consists only in the forgiveness of sins: but I have reckoned up ten advantages of it. For this cause we baptize infants also, though they are not defiled with sin; that there may be superadded to them saintship, righteousness, adoption, inheritance, a brotherhood with Christ, and to be made members of him."[4] Even St Augustine, who is so often quoted as holding that the individual is transported from damnation to salvation in the moment of Baptism, is shown by Wall not to neglect the corporate significance of the sacrament: "For infants are offered for the receiving of the spiritual grace not so much by those in whose hands they are brought . . . as by the whole congregation of saints and faithful men. . . . So that the whole church of the saints does this office as a mother. For the whole church brings forth all her children, and the whole brings forth each particular."[5]

One could wish that in his second volume Wall had given more space to the testimony of Anglican divines, and less to the aberrations of multifarious sects. He goes into some detail in his treatment of the

[1] P. 21, 1844 ed. [2] *I ad Cor.*, c. 38. [3] *Adv. Haer.*, v. 2.
[4] Homily *ad Baptizatos*. [5] Ep. 23.

ceremonies connected with Baptism, but much of his matter will not stand against the evidence brought by recent research. Particularly unsatisfactory is his reference to the imposition of hands; speaking generally of the early Church he says: "But if the person were an infant, the laying on of hands was deferred till he were of age."[1] This would not satisfy Mason[2] nor indeed any critical reader of the Fathers. It is to the great discredit of Anglican baptismal studies that in spite of these deficiences Wall retains a claim to be considered the greatest English writer on the subject. He is constantly quoted in nineteenth-century treatises on Baptism, and Bethell calls him " a learned divine, whose statements are not built upon hypothesis or fancy, but on a laborious examination of the writings of the ancient Christians."[3] Among nineteenth-century books, Bethell's *General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration* and Laurence's *Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism* labour under the individualism which Maurice, rightly or wrongly, criticizes in Pusey's tract *Scriptural Views*;[4] and Mason, in spite of the value of his work in pointing out the connexion between the laying on of hands and water-baptism in the early Church, exposes himself to the charge of *cacoethes definendi*.[5] From all this Wall is free. He is not arguing a case—at least not one which is not already accepted by the majority of the Church—and hence what he says incidentally on, say, "all National Churches are Pædobaptist" has an integrity about it which cannot be found in a tendentious treatise.

Wall does not reckon with the effect of infant baptism having become a social convention by the fifth century, and he may or may not be unwittingly arguing for infant Confirmation. Throughout his disquisition on baptizing nations he assumes the faith of parents, and hence his work does not give us a ready-made solution to twentieth-century pastoral problems. But Wall gives us a clear and unobstructed view of a wide field, attracting our gaze far beyond the confines of provincial theological controversy. He towers above later and technically better equipped writers, and well deserves Waterland's eulogy—"a learned and judicious writer."

J. C. S. Nias.

Studies in Texts

"And the winepress was trodden without the city, and there came out blood from the winepress, even unto the bridles of the horses, as far as a thousand and six furlongs."—Rev. xiv, 20.

The passage is of course founded on Isa. lxiii, especially on verse 3: "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the peoples there was no

[1] 1844 ed., Vol. II, p. 431. [2] *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism* (1891).

[3] Preface to *A General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism* (1822).

[4] The idea of Baptism saving individuals from the perishing mass, to which Maurice objected, is undoubtedly to be seen in *Scriptural Views—e.g.* (p. 162), "The child of the regenerated or Christian parent brings into the world with it nothing but the corruption of our fallen nature, and God's promise to restore it by Baptism. . . ." But it might be questioned whether Pusey's work is vitiated by such ideas to the extent that Maurice alleges.

[5] *E.g.*, "In a sense we 'receive' Him then" (in Baptism) (*op. cit.*, p. 455), and "It is, then, the objective, personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in us which is the virtue of the Laying on of Hands" (*ibid.*, p. 450).

man with me: yea, I trod them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury: and their life-blood is sprinkled on my garments, and I have stained all my raiment." It is therefore in the Old Testament version a picture of the working out of the wrath of God, and in the New Testament of the working out of His wrath as manifested in Christ. Charles is no doubt right in excising verses 15-17 of chapter xiv of the Apocalypse on the grounds that they only confuse the sense and are a doublet inspired by the parallelism of Joel iii, 13. This means excising ὁ ἄγγελος from verse 19 also.

The question is, however, what does "without the city" refer to? Charles (ed. Apoc., I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1920) calls it a proleptic vision of the time when Christ is to overthrow the pagan nations who have rejected the gospel, and he thinks it probable that the city referred to is the heavenly Jerusalem that is to descend from heaven to be the centre of the Millennial Reign of Christ and His saints on earth. (In his Commentary he distinguishes two heavenly cities referred to in the Apocalypse. One is to be on earth and to last for the thousand years; the other, which is eternal, succeeds it after heaven and earth have passed away. It is to the first that he thinks reference is made here.) He admits, however, that " without the city" may refer to the historical Jerusalem or its ruined site. In that case the vision refers to a time just previous to the descent of the first heavenly Jerusalem. He adds that in Jewish tradition the neighbourhood of Jerusalem is to be the place of the judgment of the Gentiles (*cf.* Joel iii, 2, 12). At any rate, according to Charles the passage is a proleptic vision of the judgment to be meted out by Christ to the pagan nations at the end of the present dispensation.

Charles seems to have overlooked the possibility that "without the city" might bear a reference to the Crucifixion. If so, the scene depicted in this passage is not only a proleptic vision of Christ's judgment of the nations at the end of the present era of history, but is also an indication that the judgment and wrath of God upon the nations was pronounced from the Cross, a much more profound thought than a straightforward scene of Messianic judgment. Compare Heb. xiii, 10-16, where Jesus is described as suffering "without the gate" and Christians are urged to "go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek that city which is to come." The thought here is of Christians leaving the temporal city to join Christ who is suffering outside the gates, and it seems a remarkable parallel to the passage in the Apocalypse. Swete, in his Commentary (3rd ed., London, 1922), gives a cross-reference to this passage, but does not draw out its significance.

Further light is thrown on Apoc. xiv, 20 by Apoc. xix, 11-16. Here Christ is described as *περιβεβλημένος ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι . . . καὶ αὐτὸς πατεῖ τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος*. It echoes the same passage in Isa. lxiii, 1-6, and just as in Apoc. xiv, 20 the question was "what city?" so here it is "whose blood is Christ's robe dipped in?" Charles says that it cannot be His own, since He is not here the Slain but the Slayer, and is executing divine judgment. The blood cannot either be that of the nations,

since they are not yet slain; it must therefore be that of the Parthian hosts, a reference to whose overthrow has been lost. Now it is true that in the Isaiah passage the blood on God's garments is that of His enemies, but that is in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament *can* you really separate the Slayer from the Slain in Christ? Might you not as reasonably try to separate the Priest from the Victim in Hebrews? Charles seems right, as against Swete, in identifying the "armies which are in heaven" of Apoc. xix, 14 with the glorified martyrs, rather than with the angelic hosts; if so, we have a vision of the Messiah and His saints executing judgment upon the nations who had rejected and slain them. But this very rejection, this slaying, *was* in part at least, the judgment. "His blood be on us," say the Jews in the First Gospel, and in the harlot, symbol of the Roman Empire, "was found the blood of all them that had been slain on the earth." Jesus was indeed the triumphant Messiah pictured in Isa. lxiii (Swete shows that this passage was interpreted Messianically by the Rabbis, and compare Isa. lxiii, 4-6 with Luke iv, 19), but He triumphed through His own blood: The blood of the nations shed in the Isaiah passage becomes the blood of Christ in the New Testament. Charles has not sufficiently realized the significance of a *crucified* Messiah.

Why did the author of the Apocalypse use *βεβαμμένον* where the LXX in Isa. lxiii uses *ῥαντίζω* or cognates? Charles admits that it is strange, since Aquila uses *ῥαντίζω*, but concludes that it is an example of our author's individual rendering of the Hebrew, paralleled elsewhere. Swete cuts the knot by reading *ῥεραμμένον*. But could it not be an echo of *βαπτίζω*? Christ's baptism was in His own blood. *Cf.* Mark x, 38: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" The difference between *ῥαντίζω* and *βάπτω* expresses all the difference between the Old Testament conception of God judging His enemies by shedding their blood and the New Testament one of God shedding His blood for them, and thus judging them. Moreover, of Apoc. xix, 15 Charles says there is a double reference, both to the winepress of judgment and to the cup of suffering and wrath. This again reminds us of Mark x, 38: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink?" The vision in Apoc. xix would thus be a picture of God's judgment on the nations through Christ, as manifested in the crucifixion of Christ and the martyrdom of the members of His body, a judgment that is to be consummated at the end of history.[1]

Swete, commenting on Apoc. xix, 13, comes nearer to this interpretation. He says: "He [the author] could hardly have failed to think also of the 'Blood of the Lamb' which was shed in the act of treading the enemy underfoot," and he quotes Hippolytus and Origen as interpreting the *ἱμάτιον* as Christ's flesh. But he adds: "But this view, if admitted, must be kept subordinate to the other. In this vision Christ is not presented as the Redeemer but as the Judge and Warrior." This seems unsatisfactory, and does not do sufficient justice to the profundity of the thought of the author of the Apocalypse.

[1] N.B.—This interpretation is supported by the Book of Common Prayer. See the Epistle for the Monday in Holy Week.

A great many people have been offended at the apparent ruthlessness of his doctrine of the wrath of God, but the more his theology is examined the more likely it seems that he thought of that wrath in very close connexion with the Cross, and his doctrine thus appears to be not a crude one of an angry God taking vengeance on His enemies, but the far more profound one of a loving God whose wrath and judgment are shown forth most clearly in the act whereby He took the consequences of sin upon Himself.

ANTHONY HANSON.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. C. H. Dodd is Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. T. H. Croxall is vicar of St Michael's, Sutton Court, London.

The Rev. J. C. S. Nias is an assistant priest of St Barnabas' Church, Northolt Park.

The Rev. Anthony Hanson is Theological Colleges' Secretary of the Student Christian Movement.

The Rev. J. R. Peacey is a Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral. He was formerly Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND IN INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I believe that I am speaking for many returned missionaries in expressing to you my deep concern at the disintegration manifest in the Church of England.

It is a strange experience for a member of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, who has been accustomed to constitutional episcopacy, in a Church where bishops act as a body and are obeyed by their clergy, and the 1928 Prayer Book, with only authorized variations, is used in a spirit of mutual restraint and charity by Churchmen High and Low, to go "on deputation" in England and discover that scarcely one church does exactly as another, least of all in the Holy Communion Service, that bishops pursue divergent policies in matters of faith and order, that diocesan conferences meet not to legislate but to listen, and that the clergy are a law unto themselves. Indeed, lawlessness has been erected into a cult. Some priests practise intercommunion with non-Conformists; others put unauthorized Missals upon their altars; and a visitor never knows what will be the order of the service. The offence that this causes to the laity is either unrecognized or disregarded, and certainly not related, as it should be, to the steady secession to Rome.

Stranger still is it to find that those who are foremost in claiming

the title of catholic are also foremost in disobeying their bishops and that those who are most insistent upon the bishops' authority in matters of faith and order entirely ignore their united voice, unless it echoes their own. The reference of St Ignatius, the "doyen" of "apostolic succession," to those of his day who "have the bishop's name always on their lips, but in everything act apart from him," has a very modern flavour.

But strangest of all is it to find those who thus show no regard for episcopacy themselves, and are content, as are the rest of us, to believe that the Church of England is catholic, though she does not choose her own bishops and though the Houses of Parliament, and not the bishops, are the final court of appeal concerning her doctrines and liturgy, quick to perceive the mote in their Indian brother's eye and to denounce him as uncatholic for entering upon a scheme of union in which episcopacy will be safeguarded and forms of worship ordered and the creeds believed in more certainly than in her own membership, instead of getting busy to reform themselves.

In India the constraint of the gospel and the urgency of the need have stopped all one-sided propaganda and driven the catholic, no less than the evangelical, with a full sense of responsibility, to go to the farthest lengths possible in order to understand others and to share his heritage with those who seek to share it with him. In England neither the constraint nor the sense of urgency is apparent. Some even today are more intent on excommunicating others than on teaching the faith, as St Paul bids us, through love.

In India the Church provides the one hope of unity in the midst of the hopeless intransigency of the political parties. In England the intransigency of Christian parties offers nothing but despair to those who look to the Church to provide the centre of unity of a new nation and of a new world. If the Church cannot achieve unity, what hope is there for the nations?

But perhaps there is one sadder thing still—namely, that the religious orders, to which so many of us look with deep gratitude for their spiritual help, should at this moment ally themselves, not with the cause of comprehensiveness, a wider charity of truth, which is the heart of catholicism, as of Christ and of His Church, which is the Body of Love incarnate, but with one single school of interpretation, a narrow school, which demands that its views, and its views alone, shall prevail. Moreover, such action is an abuse of that spiritual authority for which we rightly look to them. A layman is not going to distinguish between theological authority and spiritual authority. As one recently remarked to me, after being convicted of at least three erroneous statements about the S.I.U. Scheme: "Anyway, if as holy a man as Father X says so [mentioning the head of a religious order], that is good enough for me." The religious orders ought not to be in this business. As Dr Prestige has pointed out, monks by the very nature of their extreme dedication are temperamentally attracted to extreme views and have done incalculable harm at different times in the history of theological controversy. Must our religious orders become steadily more Roman in devotion

and more exclusive in theology? Bishop Gore had a very different vision, and the Oxford Mission to Calcutta and the Cowley Fathers on the spot have shown a very different charity and restraint of catholicism from the militant partisanship of the religious orders at home. Surely we look to the religious orders to unite men in the fullness of Christ and of His truth, in which "the reconciling of opposites is essential to true completeness," and to put before us the beauty of the faith by the broadness of their sympathy.

But isn't the whole spirit of this attack on the S.I.U. Scheme wrong? (It is not for me to criticize the saints, but the sinner is often the quickest to detect his own sin in others.) The Church exists not to save itself but the world. The faith does not need defending, but propagating. Our Church in South India will go into this Union, making up almost half the membership of it, with the full right to teach all that it holds dear, and, believing that the scheme is catholic, to share its faith with others. Must we not exorcise fear with faith, as our Lord did? On the other hand, the way of excommunication is self-destructive. Never has a Church been more exclusive or more ardently gloried in and safeguarded its Church principles than the Jewish Church, and it perished because of it. Never has a Church more readily sacrificed a sacred and even divinely given institution in the cause of charity than the early Church in the Council of Jerusalem, and a new world was born out of it. For it is as true of the Church as of an individual that only by losing its life can it save it.

It cannot be right for the catholic section of our Church to live in isolation, to take no part in the ecumenical movement or even sometimes in fellowship with other Anglicans. For it has so much to give. If the C.I.B.C. has erred, I believe it will be forgiven, "for it loved much," and God can more readily forgive an error of love than of harsh judgment. But those of us who attended the last two General Councils of the C.I.B.C. will not quickly forget how on each occasion, when, with heavy hearts, we were resigning ourselves to give an adverse vote, the whole climate of the debate changed, and the majority for the Scheme surprised even ourselves. There may still be delays. God may still have some better way. But at least in India they are seeking to make the Church come true through growing together in charity. The Holy Spirit cannot guide into all truth those who by propaganda are more concerned to air their own views than to learn His, like a priest, who the other day on being remonstrated with by a returned S.P.G. missionary for a most unfair presentation of the S.I.U. Scheme in a sermon, replied: "I did not mean to be fair!" Might we not ask for charity, restraint and development of and obedience to constitutional episcopacy as our first objective today in the Church of England, as the surest way of spreading the catholic faith, which we love?

Yours, etc.,

J. R. Peacey.

2 Rodney Cottages,
Clifton,
Bristol, 8.

"THE BISHOP AND HIS CHURCH"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I would like to add a further word of comment on Mr Bennett's article in the February number of THEOLOGY—the first number I have seen since coming out of the Japanese internment camp where I have been able to spend the last three and a half years in reflection. The article was of especial interest because it represents a point of view towards which my own mind has been moving as a result of twelve years' experience overseas. Although the typical overseas diocese is a great deal larger in area than a diocese in England, it is a great deal smaller in numbers of clergy and Christians. Thus, in spite of having to travel much greater distances than his opposite number in England, the bishop of an overseas diocese is able to know his clergy and people very much more intimately. I have worked under three bishops, and all have become close personal friends to whom I was able to go for help and advice, confident that they knew enough about what I was doing to be able to give it. For the great bulk of the clergy in England this is plainly impossible, and—if bishops are really any use—it is a great loss to the Church. The bishop who interferes in a parish in such a way as to hinder the work of an honest and hardworking priest ought not to be a bishop. Prof. Sykes' criticism that more bishops would mean more interference is a personal criticism of possible or actual bishops, based perhaps on recollections of unfortunate incidents in the past. A bishop who is a true "father of a family" would only intervene in a constructive and helpful manner, and he would be the better able to do this if he had a more intimate knowledge of the parishes of his diocese than is possible at present. The reason for our instinctive distrust of a system in which bishops would be in closer contact with the parishes is that they have sometimes been prone to interfere in situations of which they had insufficient knowledge. Dictatorial incumbents would also suffer a blow.

Finally, we are surely past the stage now when a priest should be tied to a particular diocese. The reasons for this in the early Church are obvious, and they hold today in many dioceses overseas, but not in England. I hope it will not be long before it becomes normal for a man serving two curacies at the beginning of his ministry to serve one in England and one abroad. In the Catholic Church there is no real distinction between working in Hoxton and working in Hong Kong, and there are plenty of jobs abroad for which no language except English is needed. We shall reap new fruits from the work which has been put into transforming the Anglican Communion from a National Church into a worldwide fellowship of Churches, when there is regular coming and going of young men from England to those Churches for longer or shorter terms of service, and from those Churches in the same way to work among us in England. The Church in England will be able to reap the benefits of the experience of the Church overseas, where in many places something not unlike the

Primitive Church can be seen alive today. In this way Christians will be able to escape from parochialism, and lead the way to that deeper and truer internationalism which is the fruit of love and understanding and sympathy, and which the efforts of science in bringing us physically closer to one another have so deplorably failed to produce.

Yours, etc.,
A. J. Bennitt.

"Annandale,"
North End Road,
London, N.W.11.
March 12, 1946.

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Since reading some recent articles in Theology on the relation of Confirmation to Baptism, it has occurred to me that this relation is parallel to the relation of the Epiclesis to the Consecration in some Western liturgies, where the Epiclesis follows the Words of Institution. In such liturgies the recital of the Words of Institution is the actual Consecration, and the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit in order that the Oblations "may be unto us the Body and Blood" is a calling down of the Holy Spirit "upon us" as well as upon "these thy gifts," the purpose being that the reality on the altar may not be hindered from becoming a reality to us by our sins and weakness of faith and love.

Similarly, Baptism is the consecration of the subject, through which he is incorporated into the Body of Christ *opere operato*. Confirmation is the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit upon the same subject, who, being a rational being and not an inanimate thing, combines in himself both ideas inherent in the two phrases "upon us" and "upon these thy gifts." And the purpose of this Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation is that the reality of his new birth and "washing" and incorporation may become active and powerful and unhindered by sin or weakness of faith or of love, by the indwelling Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is the agent in the consecration, taking the things of Jesus and bringing them to us. In the Epiclesis He is the indwelling Gift, making these same things of Jesus (*viz.*, the Body and Blood) known to us and active in us. The Holy Spirit is the agent in Baptism, grafting us into Christ. He is the Gift in Confirmation, in whom we may "daily increase" unto a lively membership in the eternal Body of Christ.

Whether the Confirmation is at the same time as Baptism, or separated by a number of years, it is still the Baptismal Epiclesis.

Yours sincerely,
A. J. Kendall Baker,
Archdeacon of Colombo.

St. Peter's Church,
Colombo,
Ceylon.
March 8, 1946.

BOOK REVIEWS

Doom and Resurrection. By J. L. Hromadka. S.C.M. 5s.

Strangers and Pilgrims. By W. R. Matthews. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

"We must still claim that Christianity enables us to 'make sense' of the world, not meaning that we can show that it is sense, but with the more literal and radical meaning of making into sense what, till it is transformed, is largely nonsense." In this revised definition of the task before contemporary theology, the late Archbishop of Canterbury made acknowledgment of the debt England owes to Europe over the last fifty years. But it is abundantly clear that there is still a yawning difference in the assessment of the religious crisis of our times between those who have, and those who have not (yet), themselves breathed in the full "stench of spiritual and moral decomposition" which rises from the pit at our feet. This difference is very evident in the two books here brought together for review.

Prof. Hromadka speaks to us out of a situation where "all is literally at stake. No one single element and norm of our civilization can possibly be taken for granted." "The old world with its traditions, institutions and creeds has collapsed; yet human society cannot live without authority and faith, without common convictions and loyalties. What is our truth? What is our authority? What is, for us, sacred and unqualifiedly valid?" Positivistic liberalism, with its debilitating relativism and its cynical indifference to these ultimate questions, may have sufficed for destruction, but it is not equal to the building of new cathedrals. And, for lack of vision, the people perish. Intellectual integrity, personal dignity and responsibility, the very elements of political right and of civilization itself have revealed themselves as turning upon an invisible hinge which we can afford to ignore not a minute longer. With infinite passion and seriousness we have to ask again, What is *the* truth? For "without truth there is no authority, without spiritual authority there is no justice, without justice there is no freedom, without freedom there is no brotherhood, without freedom and brotherhood there is no decent life, no social harmony or political unity." And, above all, as Nietzsche flung out at us, Why truth, and why not better untruth? That is the question of questions.

"Unusual powers are needed to make another wholly new beginning": so Stefan Zweig, and took his life. If this is not to be the paradigm of modern civilization where are these powers to be found? In the company of Dostoyevski, Masaryk and Barth, Prof. Hromadka conducts us through the streets of hell, in that "bleak twilight" in which modern humanity dwells "without definite and distinctive signposts, without milestones, without hedges . . . without compass and North Star." Yet here, in the midst of the fire and the very stench of corruption, is found a fourth figure, like unto the Son of Man—He, the Truth we thought we had lost when we left the peaks, our authority of wrath and unfathomable love. "He, the Crucified, knows about the gates of hell. . . . He made His grave with the

wicked and with the rich in His death. . . . He is our companion in doom; He is the Lord of resurrection."

This is a book of uncommon power and passion, a cry *de profundis*, not of resignation, but of resurrection, of Easter Day on Good Friday. The Theology of Crisis has vindicated itself as the theology of hope, of that twice-born hope which alone can speak anything to this generation.

And yet—let us never forget it—our condition is not simply that of the Continent. Where the old cathedrals stand, the words of the preacher must still be heeded. Dr Matthews' sermons from St Paul's will disappoint those who are listening for a voice in a trackless wilderness. The pilgrim's road remains remarkably well defined, and "modern knowledge" can still confirm its essential continuity from earth to heaven. But before we reach for the pickaxe, let us ponder Barth's warning: "To destroy temples is not better than to build them. The silence of devotion is not superior to the words of the preacher." "Broken earthenware" is not in itself well-pleasing to God. As Hromadka himself reminds us, if circumcision is not the self-evident "point of contact," neither, to be sure, is uncircumcision.

John A. T. Robinson.

Bristol.

The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker. By E. T. Davies. Preface by the Dean of Wells. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The passing of the Marian reaction was quickly met by the other extreme of intolerant Puritanism. At the very funeral of the Queen the congregation was warned that "the wolves be coming out of Geneva." In Parliament, council and universities the fashionable new doctrine gained its ground and even began to infiltrate the Anglican Church. At this stage its front was united against the old authority of ecclesiastical tradition, and behind a literally preached Bible which entailed two dangerous disparagements of learning and politics. "Be ye not called rabbi," so they quoted, and from St Paul at Corinth. Mr Davies remarks their "distrust of learning and a strong suspicion of the scholarly minister." In politics, with a similar barrage of literal text, a theocracy was urged and all real liberty denied to the State.

Under this stormy sky of opinion a poor student comes up from Devon to Oxford. He survives an inevitable touch of Calvinism, is fed by the best learning of Renaissance and Reformation and becomes Fellow of Corpus. But he is called away to London and the world of publicity, where Archbishop Whitgift appoints him to the Temple and directly encourages the great project of his book. He becomes happily and influentially married; we are shown how Prof. Sisson has disproved Izaak Walton's damaging account of Mrs Hooker. Finally he retires from London to become rector of a small village near Canterbury, his life seeming to pattern that blend of seclusion and social stimulus in which the mind achieves its most lasting work. Amid the fever of controversy he maintained his cool and leisurely sense of history and confident heirship to a fifteen-hundred-years'

estate of Christian learning, and his confidence induced a conciliatory approach to controversy, making his argument penetrate and last.

Such necessary background is well supplied by Mr Davies' book, and remaining chapters deal with Law, the Basis of Political Obligation, Church and State. Hooker's giving of first place to the nature of law seemed quite irrelevant to the Puritans, "yet it was the conclusion of the whole matter." In the more definitely political field Mr Davies does not condone his author's perilous approach to a doctrine of royal absolutism, and admits unsatisfactory elements in the eighth book's treatment of Church and State. Generally, this small book is both accurate and attractive. There is none of that abstract playing with concepts which often makes political theory as free from history as a game of chess. The ideas are firmly related to historical events. Indeed, I am inclined to express only one disagreement—namely, that the book deserves a more resounding title to advertise the general importance of Richard Hooker, English and European, political, cultural and religious.

E. W. Edmonds.

Maidstone.

The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine. By T. Francis Glasson. The Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

Dr Glasson's conclusions, in this extremely able and well-argued book, are that the Jewish writings extant in the time of our Lord (with the doubtful exception of the Similitudes of Enoch) do not speak of the Messiah descending from heaven in judgment, that our Lord did not proclaim His second advent, and that the belief of the early Church that He would return in judgment (a belief that has coloured many of the dominical sayings, especially in St Matthew's version) was the result of its attributing to Him what was written in the Old Testament about Yahweh's visitation of the earth. This is not a thesis into conformity with which the facts have been twisted but a belief that emerges from a patient and scrupulous survey of all the available evidence. Dr Glasson's book deserves to be very widely read, both for the intrinsic importance of its theme and as an example of criticism wisely used to elucidate a subject of cardinal importance to theology.

The first conclusion, that belief in the advent of a Messiah who would descend from heaven was absent from any Jewish teaching that could possibly have influenced our Lord, seems amply warranted by the evidence. This disposes of the possibility that He may have cast His teaching into that idiom in order to bring it home to the minds of His contemporaries. If He spoke of His second advent in judgment it was by His own unconditioned choice. The further conclusion, that later beliefs have influenced the record of His teaching, is at least compatible with the evidence, though this part of the argument must necessarily stop short of complete demonstration. It must suffice here to give the reviewer's opinion that no serious student of our Lord's teaching about the future should neglect what Dr Glasson has to say. Lastly, if the truth is that it was the early Church that began to think

of Jesus returning from heaven to earth on some day in the future, no more convincing explanation of the genesis of this belief has been suggested than that the Old Testament predictions of Yahweh's advent were taken to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The author, in a concluding epilogue, develops an optimistic view of the future of human history that seems strangely at variance with the facts of this atomic age; but this provides no justification for rejecting his argument. What is in question is not the soundness of the belief that God's work in Christ has an absolute fulfilment but the view that this will come about as the result of a literal last-day advent.

G. O. Williams.

Bangor.

The Collapse of Doubt. By F. W. Camfield. Lutterworth Press. 5s.

Dr Camfield has put together a very striking study in the basic terms of a Christian apologetic. He is modest in disclaiming originality, and says that his readers will readily detect the scholars to whom he owes an obligation. But actually he has made his material so much his own, and states it with such vigour and precision, that it would be a nice exercise for a scholarly study circle to determine its affinities to Aquinas, Karl Barth, and to some of the modern writers who, following their lead, have broken away from recent humanitarianism.

The title of the book is a little confusing, for Dr Camfield does allow a proper place for the right kind of doubt, and he is very far from suggesting that there is any sign of a general collapse of doubt in the world. Indeed he feels that the outlook is in many ways ominous. The doubt that has collapsed is not that of the man struggling to sustain some form of the theistic proofs in the face of the plain contradictions, the suffering and the injustice, which so obviously mar God's creation. It is rather the doubt of the man who, by God's grace, realizes himself to be a sinner and thereby realizes, beyond any cavil or questioning, the reality of That against which he has sinned and before which he stands naked and defenceless, with a past that cannot be undone and a present that has nothing to offer. In that moment of awareness God Himself becomes the ultimate certitude.

But the God so found and known is not the God of "natural religion" or of the proofs which are the product of man's reasoning. This is the sum and centre of Dr Camfield's case. Those who doubt the existence of God on the score of a war which He does not prevent or of irrational and undeserved suffering which He does nothing to mitigate are first of all framing their own conception of God and then denying that it corresponds with reality. Perfectly true, our human construction breaks down at every point. Dr Camfield does not hesitate to say (here going beyond Aquinas) that natural religion will not stand against the pressure of the real world. But that is because its God is not the real God. In the same way the ordinary conception of God as "Almighty" involves a complete misunderstanding of the meaning of the term "power" when we apply it to the act of God. For the use

of force is always a confession of weakness, and God's act knows neither force nor failure. In Him the past is redeemed and the present is the place where His Word comes to meet man, without check, unresting, always availing to save, as God Himself understands salvation.

An admirable book for a study group which is prepared to do some real thinking, and which already knows a little theology. To this end suitable questions for discussion on the separate chapters are appended.

L. W. GRENSTED.

OXFORD.

THE TRINITY AND CHRISTIAN DEVOTION. By C. W. Lowry. (Archbishop Temple's Lent Book for 1946.) Eyre and Spottiswoode. 4s. 6d.

THE GLORIOUS LIBERTY. By Roger Lloyd. (The Bishop of London's Lent Book.) Longmans, Green and Co. 2s. 6d.

The appearance of Archbishop Temple's Lent Book for 1946 awakens tribute both to his foresight as administrator and to his insight as theologian. He had made the choice of author and subject before his death. The subject of the book completes a set of seven. Advancing through the "moralities" and social issues of Christian action, the series now reaches the goal of doctrine. Such was the original plan; for in his preface to an earlier volume Dr Temple had himself described the whole series: "The object is to promote thoughtful devotion and devotional thought." His choice of the author is not less arresting, Dr Lowry is a priest of the American Episcopal Church, formerly a Professor in Virginia Theological Seminary, at present Rector of All Saints' Church, Chevy Chase, in Maryland. Further, his book has been adopted as this year's Lent Book by the presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. It is a timely *vinculum* between Churchmen on either side of the Atlantic and should provide a precedent for fostering Anglo-American understanding, along theological lines, among Christians in the future.

Dr Lowry's thesis is bold. "Man is, in his essence, a being who loves and reasons;" but "of the two human attributes, love or desire is prior in origin," and "reason never gains, at least with any security of tenure, the supremacy of the soul."

This, of course, does not constitute the truth of trinitarian doctrine. but it can suggest why man ultimately finds satisfaction in trinitarian religion. The doctrine of the Trinity presents him with One who is "great enough, and also sufficiently attractive and compelling, to order and direct and intensify, at a higher level, his native loyalty and devotion." This is expounded with reverence and zeal. Words and phrases in the American idiom do not distract; rather they strengthen the style for English readers. And this book is likely to put vitality—as the author would wish—into our pulpits on Trinity Sunday. But naturally enough, there are gaps in so slender a study of so grand a theme. Augustine here is interpreted chiefly as the heir to Plato, and with him the history of the doctrine halts. Dr Lowry gives us the impression that

the closest contact of Aristotle with Christianity is his influence on Arius—particularly through the *Metaphysics*, "although this is only a guess" (p. 60). He gives no direct references to the theological thought of Aquinas, who did know that work. Yet Dr Lowry might have found in thomist doctrine useful clues with which to clear up the confusion between divine attributes and the Divine Persons (see p. 97) and to bring into very sharp focus his own *motif* of "desire." In fact, the dictum that "man is predominantly an appetitive being" (p. 47) might have been lifted straight out of the *Summa contra Gentiles*.

The Bishop of London's Lent Book draws attention to the qualities of the devoted life which Christian doctrine animates. Canon Lloyd, with characteristic persuasiveness, discusses the work of the Holy Spirit. His concern is to show that "sanctification" and "holiness" are not out of date. His argument is topical, illustrated, not from philosophy but from fiction, and woven into everyday events. From "biblical lists of the gifts of the Spirit" (but omitting Isa. xi, 2) he draws his master-idea: "The peace of the world is the gift of the Spirit." Practical directions in the book will be appreciated by those who echo his quotation from Traherne: "With much ado I was corrupted and made to learn the dirty devices of the world."

W. W. S. March.

King's College,
London.

The Intention of Jesus. By John W. Bowman. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

In this book, published in America in 1943, Prof. Bowman, of Western Seminary, Pittsburg, seeks to set forth our Lord's own understanding of His mission and work. Jesus drew His conception of the Messiah from Old Testament prophecy at its highest, not from contemporary Pharisaic or Zealot interpretations. He understood Himself to be a "Messiah of the Remnant," calling faithful men *from all nations* to return to God's will, and this conception He united with that of the Suffering Servant of the Second Isaiah; thus did our Lord bring together two great prophetic ideas never previously combined. As "Son of Man" He came in humble anonymity, refusing to give any sign save that of His own personal holiness; and, having gathered the Saving Remnant, He would lead them through suffering until He came again upon the clouds of heaven to set up God's Kingdom. His work was to call and constitute a New Israel, established by a New Covenant in His own blood, which was to survive the rejection of Judaism and the destruction of its Temple, which He predicted. It was thus the *intention* of Jesus to found the Church. In all this the original and creative mind was that of an individual, the Jesus of history, not that of a community, a theologizing church.

This bare summary does not do justice to the wealth of scholarship and quotation with which Prof. Bowman has enriched his pages; he has given us an instructive and suggestive evaluation of recent Gospel criticism. But we are not perhaps entirely satisfied with his

method, even though we are in general agreement with his conclusions. Prof. Walter Marshall Horton, in his preface, describes the book as "revolutionary"; but it is doubtful whether British readers will so consider it. It indeed shows how far some American scholars have travelled from Shailer Matthews and the Social Gospel, but have they travelled far enough? The very title of the book, which is redolent (and intentionally so—see p. 166) of John Macmurray and "the religion of Jesus," raises the question how far we can with propriety probe into those inner motives of our Lord's mind, about which the Gospel-writers are so reverently reticent. Prof. Bowman pursues his inquiry from the point of view of faith in Jesus as Son of God; but there are moments when his Jesus appears in the class of "religious geniuses." The question about faith and history has not been asked at a deep enough level; despite Prof. Horton's preface, "theological predispositions" *do* affect "the most faithful portrait of our Lord that objective biblical scholarship can paint." How far is the liberal and psychological approach compatible with the standpoint of the Gospels themselves? This book should be read because it compels us to ask this question. In reading it many constructive and illuminating suggestions will be found, which are valuable for their own sake. British readers will constantly wince at the cruelty inflicted on the English language, the remarkable punctuation and the American preference for long and ugly words, which leads sometimes to the misuse of words (as, for instance, the use of "psychology" when "mind" is intended—see a deplorable sentence on p. 92). But this is a small price to pay for an Anglo-American intercourse in biblical scholarship which will undoubtedly prove highly rewarding to both sides in the years to come.

Alan Richardson.

The College,
Durham.

Reading for Profit. By Montgomery Belgion. Pelican Books. 1s.

Books originally delivered successfully as lectures are not thereby assured of a more lasting success. The present little volume had also to brave the difficulties of being written in a German prison camp, and (presumably) without all the resources the author would have liked to have at his disposal. Undoubtedly, therefore, a threefold compliment is due—to the author, to the fellow-prisoners who composed his first audiences, and to the British Red Cross. *Reading for Profit* is certainly significant as an effort in co-operation—an effort, as the author notes, in which the German military authorities also joined. And on the whole the effort does succeed, and there is something permanent here for all sorts of readers of English literature.

It would be unfair to dwell on the somewhat gangling style of delivery and suspicion of repetitiousness in the argument, for the author is at pains to point out that many in his audiences were, in the enforced leisure of the Oflags, coming to the proper reading of English for the first time. Mr Belgion sets out to deal with the whole range of English writing in the course of nine lectures, and by the sincerity of

his approach, his profound knowledge of his subject, and the charming persuasiveness of his quotations and allusions, makes a real success of a very difficult undertaking. This is popularization of the best sort, achieved without immoderate concessions. At the same time it will serve as an admirable "refresher course" to those who want to resume their serious reading in English, whether of Shakespeare or the *Comedy of Manners*, Sir Thomas Browne or Sir James Frazer, biography or poetry.

There are nine chapters in the book, of which perhaps the most attractive to readers of THEOLOGY will be the excellent chapter on "Deep Books and Difficult Reading" and the one on "The 'New' Poetry." Not that the other chapters are rudimentary; for instance, there is an excellent analysis of E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and of Hilton's *Random Harvest*, in which Mr Belgion explains why the former is significant and the latter not. In fact, throughout the book there is a refreshing reference of his arguments to the actual living "pieces of writing" which constitute literature. I know of few more acute analyses of Mr T. S. Eliot's poetry than he gives in a few pages, and in particular the setting of Mr Eliot (and by implication all our "new" poets) within the context and tradition of English poetry for the last 145 years should encourage many readers to make a fresh effort at appreciating what is being written today.

That there is also matter for dispute in Mr Belgion's contentions is all to the good. As he himself says, a book with which you wholly agree has not been as profitable as it might. For this reason, also, *Reading for Profit* may be commended. R. GREGOR SMITH, C.F.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE. By Stanley Cook. Penguin Books. 1s.

For concentrated information about the Bible, it would be impossible to surpass Prof. Cook's new Pelican book. It is not an Introduction to the Bible of the usual technical kind, limiting itself to questions of date, authorship and integrity, but an introduction in a wider sense. It contains a lightning survey of the world's religions and a rapid review of the growth and contents of the Old and New Testaments. Both are marvels of compression, and as lucid as anything so compressed could hope to be. The next chapter, on the language and ideas of the Bible, is masterly, and will well repay the most careful study. This is followed by a chapter on the place of Jerusalem and Mount Zion in the thought and teaching of both Testaments. A chapter on fundamental problems of the Bible singles out a few of the crucial questions that confront the Bible student, and particularly historical questions, and introduces the reader to the lines along which solutions are to be sought.

The final chapters, on understanding and teaching the Bible, are more difficult to understand, and the reviewer is not sure how far he has here been successful. Throughout the book there is a much deeper religious interest than the title might suggest, and nowhere more so

than in these chapters. Much in them is written less as an introduction to the Bible than as a call to some new religious advance in our day. For here, as elsewhere in his writings, Dr Cook is acutely conscious of our urgent need for a restatement of Christianity. Just what the restatement is to be, however, is not clearly indicated. That it is to be a restatement of biblical religion seems probable. For he observes: "More than any other book, the Bible has led man to understand the universe and himself; it has directed him along the road to a Truth and a Reality which no religion outside Christianity has ever conceived" (p. 208). And again: "When once this belief becomes a reality, God, and the Bible as the Word of God, are thenceforth the starting-point for convictions as to His nature and attributes" (p. 191). Just how far it has to progress beyond its biblical starting-point, however, is less clear. It has to be related to the general culture of our age. "When the religion has been a living one, there has been a coherence between it and the general culture of the age to an extent that emphatically demonstrates the lack of coherence of our day" (p. 187). It is not quite obvious whether Dr Cook thinks Christianity needs reinvigorating from the culture of our age or whether that culture is believed to need the redemption of a Christian infusion.

At times there is a suggestion that the new urge for which we are waiting will go beyond the religion of the Bible, and that what the author has in mind is a new amalgam of Christianity and the non-Christian religions, transcending Christianity. Possibly it was for this reason that the chapter on the world's religions was included. Dr Cook observes that when we emphasize the points of contact between the Bible and other sacred writings, we are taking a wider view, and building upon wider foundations (p. 196). It is just here that the reviewer feels a little in the dark, and a little doubtful where he is being led.

Yet, having said this, he returns to recognize the wealth of learning that has gone into this volume, and the many fine and memorable observations it contains. Two only, chosen almost at random, may be cited. "To say that 'God is love' is to attribute to Him no sentimentality or amiability, but an ultimate quality that lies behind whatever divine justice and righteousness must entail for men's wrongdoing" (p. 175). "The Bible is seen to enshrine the story of the election and rejection of a chosen people and the rise and conditional permanence of its successor" (p. 173). No reader will fail to find his money's worth several times over in Dr Cook's book.

H. H. Rowley.
Manchester University.

The Structure of Life. By E. L. Allen. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

We all need so much illumination as to the nature of Christian action in the contemporary world that we cannot fail to give a welcome to a book written in plain English which must stir our thinking. Dr Allen's book is fresh, acute, competent and suggestive. He is well informed and up to date, draws his quotations from widely diversified sources and chooses them with perspicacity, and is stimulating in his

comments on other writers. He discusses the relation of the absolute and the relative, the different types of action in the Bible and in history, the meaning of natural law, a sacramental society, the family, the structure of society, freedom and community. There are occasional errors, and some phrases which jar upon the mind, but at his best Dr Allen is exceedingly good—especially in the chapter on the family. He himself draws attention to Karl Mannheim's distinction between the paradigmatic vision and the adjustment character of Christian action. In terms of this, we may say that, while Dr Allen recognizes both elements, his exposition of the paradigmatic vision is not as profound as it might be. If we raise P. T. Forsyth's question, "Where is the true sight of the greatness of Christ? Is it the mere force and volume of the historic figure, or in the nature of his historic work?", Dr Allen takes the first alternative and we miss a searching understanding of the Cross. His treatment of Christian history, while illuminated by his partly justified emphasis upon sectarianism, is hardly the reassessment which meets our present need. At one point the virtual identification of prophetic religion with pacifism is not wholly convincing. On the other hand, his treatment of the adjustment character of Christian action is for the most part brilliantly done and should prove exceedingly illuminating to all readers of the book. The only criticism is that at times he overdoes it, coming near to Troeltsch's "polymorphous truth" in saying that "truth exists in a multiplicity of forms" and that "there is no hierarchy of values which is the same for all." But there are a great many people whose eyes need to be opened to the understanding of the adjustment character of Christian action, and if we take Dr Allen's book as opening up important contemporary issues in a form in which they can be discussed, rather than as providing answers to the issues, then we must say that it is a most valuable book and should be highly recommended.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

In Him is Life. By Jessie Powell. S.P.C.K. 2s.

The First Crib. By G. Evelyn Hart. S.P.C.K.

The written gospels, when they are read well, either in silence or in the worship of the church, have the power of revealing their own dramatic quality. The attempt to utilize the material for dramatic purposes only rarely achieves this end. *In Him is Life*, a New Testament play in three acts, does not read as though it will reach such high purpose. Certain aspects of our Lord's ministry and teaching are revealed through the conversations of a number of women and children, Mary and Martha, various neighbours and relations of the apostles, and, at the end, our Lady.

The conversations are interspersed with sayings from the gospels, and an attempt is made to show our Lord as "a man amongst men, in human relationships." The theology of the play, or perhaps one should say the anthropology, is reminiscent of the pre-1914 age, when it was commonly supposed that by piercing through to the human Jesus a faith in Him would be quickened for this age. The only knowledge

we have of a human Jesus is given to us in the profoundly religious, worshipful, faith documents, which we call the gospels. The attempt to sever these strands reduces the Figure of our Lord, not to a "man amongst men in human relationships," but to a picture of the accommodations which our early-twentieth-century minds were willing to grant Him. So, the swine at Gadara take a false step, the pre-eminence of Mary over Martha is lessened to the level of our domesticity, the sudden storm is as suddenly stilled (but no one asks "What manner of man is this?"), the feeding of the 5,000 is a miracle of the voluntary sharing of picnic lunches, Judas is in Paradise. . . . The traditional rendering of the Passion in Holy Week, where the dramatic element is deliberately heightened, seems to put this play very much in the shade. However, it ends on a more supernatural note, and leaves one with the impression that, if this is the case, the main body of the play hardly prepared one for it.

Nativity plays are becoming a popular event in many parishes. *The First Crib* is an attempt to achieve the Christmas scene from a very novel angle. It is the story of St Francis' setting up of the first crib; the shepherds and the wise men are provided from visitors to the cell at Greccio. The language is very reverent, there is a naturalness about the gathering of people there, and the Christmas scene is revealed in beauty and devotion. A recent notice in the press called attention to the good impression made by the play.

Cyril Gardner.

Beckett House,
Wantage.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Divine Pity. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

This series of meditations on the Beatitudes is valuable both as a devotional book for personal use and as a modern contribution to ascetic theology. As an aid in self-examination and mental prayer it is suggestive and searching, the more so because it has a firm and strong theological structure derived from St Thomas. Fr Vann has an engaging way with him, but the velvet glove covers a good muscular fist and a grip learnt from the master of all Dominicans. He can write with sympathy and insight about the human heart and can comment on man's earthly concerns with a warm and kindly humanitarianism. He insists on a right reverence for created things as an indispensable element in Christian conduct and piety. But the theocentric note predominates. Contemplation, detachment, poverty of spirit—these themes recur, as indeed the subject demands.

Teaching on prayer and the sacraments is knit into the discussion of each beatitude, as Fr Vann works out a Thomist scheme of correlated beatitudes, virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghost. The result is a body of ascetical doctrine somewhat intricate in its pattern—the book leaves an impression of being very full—but containing many wise and illuminating reflections on the moral and spiritual life. Occasionally the Anglican reader will make reservations about both the matter and

the manner of the argument; but there are few things to quarrel with and much to profit by in this book's courteous and persuasive spirituality.

H. BALMFORTH.

ELY.

The Ministry of Absolution. Notes for the Use of Confessors. By Kenneth E. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford. Dacre Press. 9d.

These are notes based upon the main questions which have been put to Dr Kirk by clergy on the subject of confession and absolution during the last twenty-five years, and also upon his own observations and inferences about mistakes that are frequently committed by those who hear confessions. They deal with the following subjects: The Sacrament of Absolution, Conditions of Absolution, Integrity of Confession, Invincible Error, Penance, Restitution and Avoidance of Occasions, Relapses and Habitual Sins, Counsel and Direction, and the Seal of the Confessional. They will prove useful to those for whom they are intended.

A. R. V.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.—The Faculty of Divinity intend to appoint a University Lecturer to teach Hebrew and the Old Testament, from October 1, 1946. Candidates are invited to write for further particulars to the Secretary, the Faculty Board of Divinity, Clare College, Cambridge.—[ADVT.]

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Charles Gore, *Prayer and the Lord's Prayer* (2s. 6d.).
CANTERBURY PRESS: D. E. W. Harrison, *The Book of Common Prayer;* F. D. Coggan, *The Ministry of the Word;* M. A. C. Warren, *Strange Victory* (6s. each).
JONATHAN CAPE: S. L. Frank, *God With Us* (12s. 6d.).
CENTENARY PRESS: Douglas Edwards, C.R., *The Defence of the Gospel* (5s.).
JAMES CLARKE: Roland Roberts, *The Hungry Sheep* (7s. 6d.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: H. M. Gundry, *The Faith of a Christian* (2s.); D. E. R. Lloyd, *The Search for Reality* (2d.).
MOWBRAY: A. E. Simpson, *The Post-War Preacher* (2s.); Reginald Lumb, *To-morrow's Teaching* (3s.); Arthur Sinker, *Sunlight and Shade in Bermondsey* (3s. 6d.); Peter Green, *The Great Commandment* (2s. 6d.); Bede Frost, *Ephesians-Colossians* (8s. 6d.); G. D. Carleton, *The English Psalter* (15s.).
NEW LIFE PUBLISHING HOUSE: Ernest Newlandsmith, *The New Reformation* (3s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: A. C. Craig and H. Martin (Ed.), *Christian Witness in the Post-War World* (3s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: Frank Bennett, *Laodicea in the Twentieth Century* (1s. 6d.); C. M. Chavasse, *The Meaning of the Cross* (6d.); N. Zernov, *The Russians and their Church* (7s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: M. E. A. Clark, *Methods of Teaching Religion to Children* (6s.); Lilian Dalton, *The Church and the Land* (1s.).
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS: L. Dewar and C. E. Hudson, *Christian Morals* (7s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher